

The University of Chicago

THE GERMAN
UNIVERSITIES AND THE GOVERNMENT

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF
THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COMMITTEE ON HISTORY OF CULTURE

1938

By

EDWARD Y. HARTSHORNE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
THE ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
Vol. 200, November, 1938

The University of Chicago

THE GERMAN
UNIVERSITIES AND THE GOVERNMENT

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF
THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COMMITTEE ON HISTORY OF CULTURE

1938

By

EDWARD Y. HARTSHORNE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
THE ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
Vol. 200, November, 1938



The German Universities and the Government

By E. Y. HARTSHORNE

I. A GLANCE AT THE RECORD BEFORE 1933

IN JUNE 1937 the University of Göttingen celebrated its two-hundredth anniversary. Reminded of the Heidelberg celebration of the year before, at which academic visitors from all over the world had been treated to that sort of political jubilee for which the Third Reich is now famous, few American, English, or French universities sent delegates, fearing that they would be asked to commemorate not two centuries of Göttingen but four years of National Socialism—four years which had meant for the little Hanoverian university the loss of more than half its former teachers, the reduction of the size of its faculty by 15 per cent and of its student body by more than 50 per cent, the disruption of its gay and colorful student organizations, the disbanding of some of its world-famous institutes, and the virtual disappearance of its traditional academic liberties. Instead there had emerged a new so-called “political university,” zealously devoted to fulfilling its part in the national Four-Year Plan for Science.

Between the new setting of the university and that of its eighteenth-century birth there were certain rather striking similarities, although Göttingen itself developed under the influence of the English enlightenment and presented an exception to conditions then prevailing in other German universities.

EARLY RESTRICTIONS OF UNIVERSITIES

In Prussia, for example, Frederick William I grew alarmed over the

“atheistic” implications of Christian Wolff’s philosophy at Halle, and in 1723 ordered him banished within forty-eight hours. Some years later this King’s successor decided that Wolff was not so dangerous as he had been represented to be, and invited him to return. In 1735, when it appeared that certain Halle professors were neglecting their duties in failing to give the required number of public lectures, the King threatened to send a company of soldiers to bring them to reason. When the philosopher Kant published a book which seemed to Frederick William II to offend against true Christian principles, he had Kant informed (1794) that he was thereafter forbidden to write or lecture on religious matters. (When the King died three years later the seventy-three-year-old philosopher promptly published a justification of his own position.) A professor whose ideas displeased the ruler had no legal protection.

Even before the age of absolutism, the university teacher found his freedom cramped by ecclesiastical strictures and by the rulings of his fellow academicians. The university was from the beginning a guild of teachers, who in their zeal to promote uniformity of professional qualifications often insisted on doctrinal conformity as well. As late as the middle of the seventeenth century (1653) the Philosophical Faculty of Marburg passed an official resolution to keep Cartesianism out of the university and especially away from the students, in favor of “Aristotle and all those other philosophers who have been hitherto revered and accepted.” In 1621 the Medical Faculty of Rinteln had directed its members to teach what

Hippocrates and other authorities had taught. By 1696 the statutes of Jena were a little more lenient: Aristotle was not to be criticized, but if it was desired to make students acquainted with certain errors in his system this might be done, but only "with the consent of the entire Philosophical Faculty." Thus did professors themselves set a precedent for the suppression of free scientific inquiry.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, and especially in the first decade of the nineteenth, the German universities underwent a spiritual renaissance. The philosophers Fichte and Schelling, the scholar and administrator Wilhelm von Humboldt, the preacher-humanist Friedrich Schleiermacher, and a number of others advanced the bold doctrine that a university exists primarily for the furthering of knowledge, and that the state should not only guarantee the university freedom from political interference but should assume a positive responsibility for the promotion of scientific progress as well. The famous German "tradition" of academic freedom was at last launched on its modern career.

Unfortunately the German university of the nineteenth century was not a perfect realization of the principles of the idealists who helped bring about the founding of the universities of Berlin (1810) and Bonn (1818) and the re-founding of Breslau (1811) and Munich (1826). The repressive Carlsbad Decrees of 1819 brought a whole series of curtailments of academic liberties in their wake; and in 1837 seven leading professors of Göttingen who issued a protest against what they held to be the unconstitutional action of the new King of Hanover were summarily dismissed, and a flood of controversial literature appeared in which both sides were hotly argued. An adequate discussion of all cases of arbitrary inter-

ference with university teachers in this generally dark period (1819-70) would fill a large volume.

UNDER THE EMPIRE

Under the Empire, when Helmholtz and numerous other scholars boasted that German institutions of higher learning, then at the zenith of their fame, were the freest in the world, academic appointments were still far from being determined solely on scientific grounds. (One may legitimately doubt whether this ideal has *ever* been achieved, any time, anywhere.) Dostoevski saw "chauvinistic tendencies even in science" in the Germany of 1873. Nonconformists in socio-political or religious matters were especially at a disadvantage.

The case of Dr. Leo Arons, a young *Privatdozent* in Physics at the University of Berlin who lost his teaching rights in 1898 because he was an active member of the Social Democratic party, gave rise to the so-called "Lex Arons" of the following year, in which the Prussian Government declared as a matter of principle: "The deliberate promotion of Social Democratic aims is inconsistent with holding a position as teacher in a royal university."

Nevertheless, the Arons case should not be taken as evidence that all liberals were excluded, for many held posts, and as long as they were well-behaved, the Government did not touch them. It was deemed improper that a state-appointed teacher should deliberately seek to inculcate an attitude of disrespect or scorn towards the fundamental principles of the state, but mere political sympathies, so long as they did not seem to interfere with that habit of intellectual impartiality then (as now) regarded as essential to the teaching profession, brought difficulties to no one.

Outside the university, of course, the

teacher was supposed to maintain a measure of dignity becoming to a member of the Civil Service, though even here he was granted more leeway than most; but he was not expected on any occasion to make campaign speeches for the Government. There were occasional public reprimands, and doubtless behind the scenes the hand of the Ministry made itself felt even more frequently; but all in all, the favorable judgment of German scholars of the day, men like Paulsen, Virchow, Helmholz, Delbrück, and Kuno Francke (for who should know better?) may be accepted.

UNDER THE REPUBLIC

The situation of the universities under the Weimar Republic was a peculiar one. On the one hand their legal liberties were greater than ever before: the new Constitution supported them, there was a general atmosphere of liberalism, and the Prussian Ministers of Education, Haenisch, Becker, and even Grimme, were avowed enemies of reaction. On the other hand, this very attitude of tolerance, together with the unstable character of the national policies, produced a situation in which sympathizers with every viewpoint from imperialism to communism could use their academic positions for political purposes. The democratic government found itself especially harried by certain veterans of the prewar days who took no pains to conceal their dislike for the new Republic; yet, if the Ministry sought to reprimand them, the accusation of anti-liberalism arose on all sides. In some cases faculty cliques sympathetic to Social Democracy resisted efforts of their own government to secure a more representative distribution of professorships.

It is not surprising under these circumstances—the freest in German history, yet (as even German liberals ac-

knowledge) perhaps too free—that university spokesmen in the years before 1933 were voicing their uncertainty as to whether academic freedom could outlive the reactionary and collectivistic dangers inherent in the unstable multipartied democratic state. Part of the early sympathy for National Socialism in university circles was probably stimulated by a feeling that liberalism had gone too far. The Nazi denunciation of scientific objectivity seemed to some to be at least partially justified by a situation in which the privilege of academic freedom had been misused as a shield from behind which to attack the very foundations of the then existing government. If in their initial effort to eliminate party politics from the universities the National Socialists went a great deal further and imposed a single authoritarian political dogma, the responsibility rests in part at least with those who were unable to maintain the dignity of the academic calling within the “liberal” universities.

II. STATUS OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS UNDER NATIONAL SOCIALISM

The term “academic freedom” has had at least three traditional associations in German history. From medieval times down till 1879 the guild of scholars was granted certain privileges of judicial trial which raised its members above ordinary citizens. Likewise the community traditionally recognized certain immunities of the student body. But more important for the history of science and learning than judicial prerogatives and student immunities were those privileges, also of medieval origin, which granted to the universities the power to determine, by and large (except for certain officially stipulated requirements for state examinations in modern times), the in-

tellectual content of the academic curriculum and the methods of teaching, to pass judgment on the qualifications of students by granting academic degrees, and to recruit new members of the teaching staff—for the most part theoretically without interference from outside. When finally the principle of the freedom of science and learning achieved constitutional status in the Frankfort Declaration of Rights of 1848 and in the Prussian Constitution of 1850, it was this latter intellectual sphere of academic autonomy which was guaranteed. Article 142 of the Weimar Constitution of 1919 reaffirmed the principle and appeared furthermore to commit the state to a positive responsibility: "Art and Science, and instruction in them, are free. The State guarantees them protection and participates in their cultivation."

The National Socialist government has as yet issued no constitution, but on February 28, 1933, it suspended those articles of the Weimar Constitution guaranteeing freedom of person, speech, press, assembly, and other "rights of the individual." While Article 142, guaranteeing academic freedom, was never specifically annulled, before the first year of rule had expired the changed status of the academician was made clear in a new set of principles to be followed in reorganizing university administration, which aimed to put into practice the ideal of the "political university." In order to appreciate the significance of the change it will be necessary to review briefly the older administrative system.

FORMER ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM

The division between what may be called the business and the scientific spheres of university administration has its origin in the twofold legal character of the universities. On the one

hand, they still bear traces of the private guild-like associations which they once were. As guilds they had control over matters pertaining to the "arts" which it was their "privilege" to teach, and from these arts there have developed the subjects of the modern university curriculum. Hence it is natural that matters closely related to learning as such should have remained largely in the hands of the university faculties. But on the other hand, the German universities had always been state institutions as well, in that they received funds from the public treasury and were governed under the supervision either of the ruler himself or of his intermediary.

Even under the Republic this dual character was maintained. Highest executive in university affairs was the Minister of Education of each State (*Land*). Under him (in some States) stood an official (generally called the *Kurator*) whose function it was to mediate between the Minister and the university self-governing bodies. These bodies were of two sorts, again illustrating the division of labor between general administrative functions and matters requiring special scientific competence: the former were left in the hands of a senate, consisting of the rector of the university, the dean of each of the four faculties (Theology, Law, Medicine, and Philosophy), and certain specially delegated professors from the faculties at large; while the latter, scientific matters as such, were managed by the ordinary professors and certain selected subordinates (with minor variations from State to State) in each faculty, a group known as the Inner Faculty, presided over by a dean. This inner faculty was the real locus of traditional academic privileges, and the older regimes, at least under Empire and Republic, left them largely untouched, on the wise principle that

science would thrive best if left in the hands of those who presumably knew most about it.

The National Socialists, since they were pledged to carry through a political revolution in the universities, dispensed with these traditions. State supervision was simplified by abolishing the representative bodies and elected officials of the faculties and by substituting state appointees, although these were still chosen *from* the faculties. The rector had formerly been elected from among the ordinary professors of the university, by the assembled inner faculties and the deans, to serve for a year. His election had to be approved by the Minister, but he was essentially the elected delegate of the faculties, serving over them as their representative, but in all other respects their equal, as were also the deans.

NEW ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM

Under the new scheme the office of *Kurator* disappeared and the rector himself became the agent of the Minister in controlling university policy; the Reorganization Law of April 3, 1935 defines the rector succinctly as "the *Führer* of the university." The faculty as a whole was organized as the *Dozentenschaft* or teaching staff under a leader (*Leiter*: a term less sacrosanct than *Führer*) directly responsible to the rector, and the student body was organized in like manner as the *Studentenschaft*. The senate still survived, but in name only: the professorial delegates previously elected by the faculties in addition to the deans and the rector were now to be appointed from the teaching staff at large by the rector. The old inner faculty, which had had charge of matters of the utmost academic importance, was not mentioned in the new regulations. The destruction of autonomy was thus complete. Furthermore, a new extra-academic

power made itself felt within the very faculties themselves, in the form of militant National Socialist minorities organized as the University Teachers' League (*Dozentenbund*), constituting Party cells within the university, paralleling the National Socialist Student League among the students.

In this way the administration of the universities was thoroughly centralized and made a mere branch of the national political system controlled by the Party. The last remnants of the guild structure of the university had been swept away. No longer was there any institutional barrier between the political sovereign and academic policies. The responsibility for science had been shifted to the rector and his *Führer*. How then were the technical academic prerogatives of granting degrees and of making appointments to be administered under the new order?

DEGREES AND TEACHING APPOINTMENTS

Under the old scheme the granting of degrees (a right known as *Promotion*) and the conferring of the teaching privilege (*Habilitation*) had been wholly in the hands of the faculties. When it was a matter of making an appointment to a professorial chair, the faculty concerned had the right to propose three names to the Minister, and the latter generally chose one of the three for the appointment, although he was in no way, except perhaps by academic tradition, constrained to do so. According to leading authorities in such matters, about a quarter of all the appointments in Prussian universities in the faculties of Protestant Theology, Law, and Medicine, 1817-1900, were made directly by the Minister, either against, or in the absence of, faculty nomination.¹ Accurate figures for later

¹ The estimates are not wholly satisfactory: there are certain internal inconsistencies; the va-

periods are lacking, but the phenomenon of "imposed" appointments was by no means unknown, even under the Republic.

As for the granting of degrees, this right in the medieval period was equivalent to conferring the right to teach. But with the sinking of standards in the eighteenth century, so low in some cases that universities would not permit even their own doctors to teach, the Government was eventually forced to take action. An additional test became necessary, supplementary to the doctor's degree, to select qualified teachers. From this need arose the faculty privilege of *Habilitation*, by which candidates were granted the right to teach only after a supplementary dissertation and a demonstration lecture had been approved.

NAZI REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHERS

The National Socialists have created still a third prerequisite, a part of the so-called *Dozentur*, in the course of which the candidate must demonstrate his personal, moral, and especially his political, fitness for the job of teaching in a National Socialist university. "Only he who feels himself inwardly attached to the community of his people, and who gives voice to this feeling by his acts, is fit to become a university teacher"—thus reads the law of October 18, 1933. Foreigners may take the

rious periods within the nineteenth century are not sufficiently distinguished; and the Philosophical Faculty is omitted. The proportion of "Ministerial appointments" is highest in Theology and lowest in Law, with Medicine occupying an intermediate position. Bornhak states (*Rechtsverhältnisse*, 33) that between 1817 and 1895, 323 appointments out of 1,236 (26.2 per cent) were "without or against" the faculty nomination. Paulsen (*Dt. Universitäten*, 101-2 n., citing the *Nordd. Allgem. Ztg.* of Dec. 5, 1901), dividing the period in two, gives 240 out of 859 (27.9 per cent) for 1817-82, and 82 out of 496 (16.5 per cent) for 1882-1900, with 23.8 per cent for the whole period.

tests for the *Habilitation*, but not for the *Dozentur*. In a semiofficial commentary on the new training regulation an important official in the Ministry wrote early in 1935:

It is especially the young *Dozent* who has the power of making the deepest personal impression on the students; the National Socialist State, therefore, can intrust with important educational tasks only those men who are willing and able to be true Leaders and Trainers of youth in addition to giving them scientific instruction.

Part of the *Dozentur* examination at first consisted in serving a certain number of weeks at a "Community Camp" and afterwards in a "Teachers Academy." In the first an effort was made to test the candidate's adaptability by subjecting him to conditions of simple life and hard physical labor in a closely knit group of companions. Woe betide him who failed to display the proper "group-spirit." In the second institution the prospective teacher was given a final training in political and social attitudes in a course of special discussions and lectures on the fundamental principles of National Socialism. Here the candidate was tested again for signs of latent resistance to the demands of disciplined group life. In the revised four-week "Teachers' Course" which went into effect May 11, 1937, candidates were to be made aware of "the problems which are of central importance to both Science and Research"—a rather more serious aim, which may be indicative of a new official attitude toward scientific training.

Habilitation under the new scheme of things requires the approval of the Minister, the ostensible reason being the intent to exclude men of the officially "undesirable" categories, chiefly "Non-Aryans" and those deemed "politically unreliable." Jews have been excluded (since April 15, 1937) even from taking the doctor's degree, and

part-Jews may take it only with the permission of the Minister of Education. Thus at the very basis of the new recruiting system large classes of potential candidates are legally excluded on grounds of ancestry or belief. Future professors, selected by a rigorous sifting process, must first of all convince their examiners that their loyalty to the *Führer* is unswerving. Refusal to take the loyalty oath is decisive, and the oath once taken establishes what one semiofficial spokesman calls "a personal, lifelong tie of fealty like that of the ancient Germans or of the medieval vassal to his liege lord." The contemporary German professor would appear to have no more to expect from his "Leader" than had Kant from his "Ruler" in 1794, and possibly less, since in the new state a loss of citizenship for "political" (though not for purely "racial") reasons carries with it the loss of one's academic degrees!

This series of measures thus destroyed one of the distinguishing features of the famous German *Privatdozententum*, that group of independent private teachers at the state universities, whose existence many had felt to be the chief support of academic freedom.

PROMOTION AND DEMOTION

The right of *Berufung*, or of making faculty appointments of professorial rank, has fared little better. While the faculty right has not in this instance been specifically denied, in practice the Ministry has been the real mover. If proof were needed, one would have only to note the increase in forced transfers as against "calls" listed under the "Personalialia" in the Official Bulletin of the Ministry of Education—the first depending on ministerial decree, the second supposedly on faculty initiative. In the older scheme each good scholar passed through a series of

promotions in academic status and in income by being "called" from one university to another, sometimes having taught in the natural course of advancement in as many as eight or more different institutions. The "transfers," on the other hand, engineered directly by the Ministry, are in the new scheme used, at least in part, as a means of demotion in prestige.

The weapon of forced transferal is used especially against professors in desirable locations who would not ordinarily be tempted to accept a "call" from a lesser university or faculty. A teacher may thus against his will be removed from a large to a small university, from a renowned to an undistinguished department, or be shuttled about from institution to institution so rapidly and so arbitrarily that, while not being actually dismissed, he begins perhaps to feel as helpless, as resentful, and as incapacitated for fruitful work as if he were.

A notable instance of this sort of demotion was the transferal in October 1935 of one of Germany's outstanding jurists from Berlin to Göttingen, probably because his presence had become embarrassing to an eminent rival who had succeeded in ingratiating himself with the new Ministry. The news came to this professor quite unexpectedly, just ten days before the winter semester was to open, so that his friends had to help him move his family and belongings to his new location. A prominent historian at Berlin was transferred at the same time to Halle, so suddenly that students who had come to Berlin especially to study with him did not learn of his removal until they had already registered, since his courses were still announced in the catalogue. Another reputable historian during the winter of 1935-36 taught at no fewer than three of the smaller universities, one after another,

at first commuting, but eventually moving his household. Because of the sudden departure of two members of the Philosophy Department at Berlin during the same winter, men whose courses on "Epistemology" and "Kant" had been announced in the catalogue, Professor Alfred Bäumler, leading Nazi philosopher, who had announced courses on Herder's Nationalism and on Political Philosophy, was given an opportunity, as the supplement of the catalogue indicated, to turn his hand at the last minute to "Kant" and "Epistemology."

Even if the appointment of new teachers of professorial rank does not in all instances depend directly on ministerial initiative, it may be seriously doubted whether that portion of the old right of calling which may be retained by the university faculties today confers on them any real measure of autonomy. The old faculty privilege of making appointments, formerly intended as a protection against state interference on political grounds, has thus wholly lost its significance, since the criteria of selection are determined by energetic Party representatives on the faculty itself.

That the Minister of Education finds it difficult under these circumstances to gain an unbiased impression of the scientific qualifications of a possible appointee is clearly expressed in his communication to the Faculty of Berlin, dated May 6, 1935, in which the Minister complains that the professors he has called in for consultation have apparently not been speaking their true minds. Because of the deplorable effect of this lack of candor on his judgment, the Minister directs the Rector to report on possible sources of the pressure to which the professoriate had apparently been subjected. The professors themselves are commanded to turn in explicit reports on the matter:

to explain to the Minister, in other words, just how it happens that the University is not proceeding on strictly scientific principles!

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF SCHOLARS

Another real restriction on the university teacher under the new regime, besides those involved in the recruiting system, is the maze of difficulties confronting a scholar invited to a foreign country, perhaps for a permanent appointment. In such an event he must first report to the rector or the Minister any correspondence he may have received inviting him to accept an academic post, or even to participate in a scientific congress abroad. Second, he can accept such invitations only with the approval of the Ministry. His intention to go abroad for scientific purposes must be reported at least six weeks in advance, and he must submit copies of all speeches he intends to make or articles he intends to publish, even including those he might, in the ordinary course of events, have written for German periodicals while in Germany. In all cases the approval of the local leader of the National Socialist University Teachers' League (and sometimes of other local officials) must be obtained. Copies of the permission papers must be sent to the Foreign Office and to other bureaus. If he is abroad for more than three months, the scientist must keep in touch with his country's foreign representatives, and when he returns to Germany he must submit a full report of the trip, commenting especially on "important political or cultural-political observations."

Here again one is reminded of eighteenth-century conditions, when it was quite customary for a prince or king to forbid professors in "his" university to accept "foreign" offers, even to neigh-

boring German states. It was desired, in founding the University of Göttingen, to call two prominent jurists from the University of Halle, less than a hundred miles away, but in Prussia, while Göttingen was in Hanover. But the King of Prussia forestalled the attempt by decreeing, April 22, 1733: "No professor may accept foreign invitations without risking a severe penalty, since requital will be taken on the entire university." When a Professor Lindner of Königsberg received a call to St. Petersburg in 1766 the King, this time Frederick the Great, declared: "*Ich wil nicht, das man mehr Leute aus dem Land de-bauchire.*"

Moreover, because of the regulations restricting the exportation of German currency, German scientists going abroad, while allowed more than the ordinary citizen, are virtually dependent on foreign support if they are to remain outside Germany more than a few weeks, especially if they travel considerable distances. Finally, it is often difficult for the German scientist offered a position abroad to obtain admission from the immigration authorities of the country to which he is invited; and, even though this aspect of his quandary is a result of general economic conditions the world over, the hesitancy of many countries to accept German *émigrés*, even gifted intellectuals, is a direct consequence of National Socialist policies, which have flooded the already heavily taxed liberal countries with a new wave of political exiles.

Once granted permission to attend a scientific congress abroad, however, the German scientist finds himself still subject to the restraints of his home government. Real intellectual participation with thinkers of other countries, and especially with his former German colleagues now living abroad,

is made difficult if not impossible under these circumstances. One observer at the Paris Philosophical Congress in the summer of 1937 reported that some of the German delegates seemed more like specters than philosophers, while others utilized the meetings for political speech-making. Out of some hundred German-speaking delegates at the Congress, about thirty came from Germany, while twenty-six others were *émigrés*!

The embargo, however, applies to intellectual imports as well as to exports. The ministerial decree of January 9, 1935 specified that in the future all foreign lecturers at German universities must be approved by the Minister before being given their appointments, and that time must be allowed for an investigation, sometimes to be conducted through the Foreign Office. It had recently come to light, the decree explained, that a number of these lecturers had expressed views which indicated that they did not "belong to that group of foreigners who are desired as guests or lecturers at German universities from the standpoint of our cultural policy."

UNPLEASANT CO-WORKERS

Virtually deprived of his rights in the selection of his colleagues, the German professor under National Socialism finds it difficult in many cases to secure the coöperation of technical assistants suited to his needs, merely because they may not happen to satisfy the requirements of race or attitude so stringently demanded by the new state. More than one scholar has been driven from his office by being deprived of his assistants, even scholars who themselves could meet the most exacting test as to eligibility according to National Socialist standards. Many others, hesitant to take the desperate step of voluntary resignation, remain

in their official posts, but hedged in by uncongenial and perhaps none too friendly co-workers foisted upon them by a regime they are forced to accept.

Something of the prevailing atmosphere is conveyed by the following incident. Not long ago two professors were about to leave the teachers' room at their university, when they noticed that one of their colleagues had left his brief-case. Looking inside to determine the ownership, they found a mass of notes on their own and their colleagues' informal conversations, evidently destined for the authorities. The story spread quickly, and the offender soon found himself ostracized. When he asked the reason, and was told, he replied with some surprise, "Why, you don't suppose I'm the only one doing this, do you?"

INSECURITY OF PROFESSORS

The pathetic insecurity of the professor is revealed in the publicity given to a recent declaration by the Law Faculty of a southern German university that in approving a doctoral dissertation, it did not thereby commit itself to the opinions expressed therein. Evidently the opinions in this particular case were none too cordial towards the present regime, for the faculty was sharply criticized in the official journal, *Jugend und Recht*, for failure to shoulder its proper responsibility.

Most important of all the teacher's professional rights is the right to teach, and the National Socialist regime has found means of silencing the professor even when he still outwardly enjoys all the dignities of his office. One of the most insidious techniques is that of unobtrusively excluding professors from examination committees. Gradually word spreads among the students that Professor So-and-so never examines, and attendance at his courses falls off. If perchance the moment arrives when

no students register for his courses, meanwhile flocking to the Nazi professors whose influence is decisive, then the Minister gently inquires of the deserted professor whether, in view of the circumstances, he does not think it best to retire. Even if he does not care to "retire," his actual teaching influence may thus be reduced to *nil*. (This mode of "control" had, incidentally, been legally permissible under the old regime, but its use had been frowned upon as a gross violation of liberal principles.)

Freedom implies not only freedom at a given moment, but assurance that the state of freedom will endure; academic freedom especially seems to demand some guarantee that the institutional status of the teacher will not be subject to willful intrusions and interruptions. In this sense there is something to be said for the view that academic life is in its essence "bourgeois." And in the same sense it might be argued that for many university teachers academic life under National Socialism is a sort of "proletarian" existence, not in terms of income but of security.

Even brilliant success as a ranking National Socialist ideologue does not always guarantee permanence of office. The regime that engineered the "blood purge" of June 30, 1934 does not hesitate to strike at "loyal" university teachers who for some reason or other have become superfluous or embarrassing to the government. The case of Carl Schmitt is illustrative. A jurist of considerable repute under the Republic, Schmitt was able to adapt his ideas readily to changed circumstances, and by the Winter Semester of 1935-36 he was not only the most popular lecturer at the University of Berlin but one of the chief draftsmen of National Socialist legislation. But in December 1936 he was attacked without any

warning in *Das Schwarze Korps*, extreme Nazi weekly, and accused of inconsistency and opportunism of character, and worse things left ominously unmentioned. (One recalls that for Frederick the Great, even the fascinating Voltaire eventually became a mere "orange squeezed dry.") Even less secure, those whose reputation is already shaky in the eyes of the state live out their academic careers under a very real sword of Damocles.

DISMISSALS

The whole practice of the Third Reich with regard to dismissing university teachers has been a repudiation of the traditional inviolability of office which was the privilege of judges and professors as civil servants. The very law which was used to justify by far the greater part of the faculty dismissals was enacted in the name of reconstructing or restoring the Professional Civil Service. Civil servants were thus dismissed in the name of an improved Civil Service, but while the form of legality was adhered to, the actual specification of the grounds of dismissal in such flexible terms as "inadequate training" or "political unreliability," and the application of these provisions to borderline cases, provoked a general impression of arbitrary rule rather than legal procedure. The only unambiguous condition of dismissal was the fact of having certain portions of Jewish blood, but the incidence of this part of the law appeared to many to be the most arbitrary of all, since it inflicted punishment for a condition lying wholly outside the individual's sphere of free choice.

The manner in which many of the dismissals occurred, resulting from denunciations by students, servants, or even jealous or overzealous colleagues, from lecture boycotts engineered by National Socialist student organiza-

tions, and so forth, enhanced the feeling of arbitrariness already awakened by the statute itself; and the series of salary cuts and transfers from one university to another which frequently preceded dismissal increased the professor's sense of helplessness.

RETIREMENT

Even in retirement, old privileges have gone by the board. Although officially "emeritus," one who has been relieved of his official duties by the National Socialist government is really in the class of those who have been dismissed from the state service—a much lower category. The old process (already modified under the Republic) of making a man emeritus at the age of sixty-five or sixty-eight was simply the granting of an official permission for the professor to stop teaching if he so desired. There was formerly no way to force a professor to retire as long as he was in good health and committed no crime. The Republic began to introduce the system of compulsory retirements at sixty-five (or, in the absence of a successor, at sixty-seven), leaving unimpaired, however, the right to teach; but those who have been made emeritus by the new Civil Service regulations have really been pensioned, that is, deprived of all their rights except that to a part of their salary. If they wish to teach they must be specially commissioned to do so, and only in such a case are they allowed to participate in examinations. They cannot even advise a student on the subject of his dissertation without the express permission of the rector of the university.

Nor is the retired professor's financial position as satisfactory as it was. The highest earnings under the Republic rarely exceeded 40,000 marks a year, including perhaps as much as 18,000 or even 20,000 marks in tuition

receipts. By 1936 a professor whose path toward retirement had started with a leave of absence of several semesters beginning in 1933 would have lost all his tuition receipts, and would have been lucky if he were still receiving 15,000 marks as a pension.

A man of the rank of *Privatdozent* might have been getting as much as 7,000 marks a year. If dismissed, he lost all this, since, not being a state official, he would not be eligible for a pension. Some especially deserving *Privatdozenten* in the "undesirable" categories, for example those who had fought in the war, were given the option of applying for a special dispensation, even though their right to teach had been withdrawn. In how many cases this dispensation was actually granted, it is difficult to say; the writer knows of one case where it was not. Some *Privatdozenten*, however, even in retirement, were receiving in 1936 as much as 3,000 marks a year from the state. In addition, more than one highly qualified research worker in the applied sciences was receiving unsolicited subsidies from wealthy industrialists, who thus sought to maintain the scientist's capacity for work and possibly dissuade him from accepting foreign offers, even though, by the regulations of the Labor Front, they would have been forbidden to employ him in their laboratories. It is probable that some scientists of the *Privatdozent* level were thus saved from starvation, and that others, even men of higher ranks, were taken over by private concerns after having been dismissed by the state; but for the most part, the lot of the displaced research scientist, deprived of his technical apparatus and of his co-workers, was difficult, more difficult even than that of the literary scholar, and with no prospect for improvement, barring succor from abroad.

HONORS FOR SCHOLARSHIP

Because of the localized ideals which National Socialist officials have attempted to set for German scholarship, any signalization of scientific achievement irrespective of nationality has been declared taboo. The following official communication from the Minister of Education, dated October 6, 1937, may fittingly close the discussion of the status of university teachers:

Not only are Germans forbidden to accept Nobel Prizes either for Peace or for Science, according to the decree of the Führer and Reichs-Chancellor establishing a German National Prize for Art and Science (January 30, 1937), but they are also forbidden to participate in the nomination and recommendation of candidates for Nobel Prizes.

I beg that this decree be brought to the attention of all scientists concerned *confidentially*. It will not be published in the Official Bulletin of the Ministry.

Under this forced boycott of the Nobel Prize the German scholar was officially condemned to accept honors only from his own country; but his country, by this same act, renounced its allegiance to internationally recognized standards of scholarly achievement.

NOTE ON FACULTY TURNOVER

Something of the effectiveness of the new policies governing the selection and dismissal of university teachers may be inferred from the fact that by the Winter Semester of 1936-37 no fewer than 2,532 members of the teaching staffs in office (and teaching) four years before (5,382), or some 47.1 per cent, had been "lost," only 216 of these 2,532 faculty "losses" being due to death. The remaining 2,316 losses are to be accounted for in part by normal retirements because of age, but in the main they result from the special dismissal or transfer policies in accord with National Socialist principles. Otherwise it is hard to understand why, in the four years *pre-*

ceding Hitler's "reconstruction" of the universities (between the Winter Semesters of 1928-29 and 1932-33), there was not a faculty loss at least roughly approximating that from 1932-33 to 1936-37. But the contrast is striking. In the earlier period there was an average loss per university of 25.8 per cent, as against 47.1 per cent for the later period. One might perhaps infer, under the circumstances, that a figure approximating the difference of 21.3 per cent is due to the abnormal dismissal policy of the National Socialists; and as a matter of fact this inference finds positive confirmation from other sources, such as the case records in the files of foreign academic relief organizations (especially the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning, in London).

But it is only when taking the abnormal turnover together with the normal that one begins to gain an accurate impression of the transformation of the teaching staffs. While the universities had lost on an average 47.1 per cent of their teaching personnel in the first four years of National Socialism, they had in the interim gained a total of 1,682 new members, constituting an average of 37.2 per cent of the 1936-37 staffs—and these new members had been gained largely by the National Socialist methods of recruitment. On the reconstituted faculties, then, there were in all 2,850 survivors from the 1932-33 staff and 1,682 new members (1,225 gained outright, and 457 gained by transfer from other universities). In certain universities the turnover was still more striking. Berlin, for example, lost 400 out of a staff of 707, or 56.6 per cent, including only 38 cases of loss by death; meanwhile, 239 new members were gained, or 43.8 per cent of the new staff of 546. On its reconstituted staff Berlin thus had 239 new members to 307 old; Frankfurt had 81 new to 132 old; Göttingen, 86 new to 106 old; Freiburg, 70 new to 94 old; Heidelberg, 87 new to 92 old! The universities which underwent the greatest staff reconstruction under National Socialism were Kiel, with 57.3 per cent lost and 44.6 per cent gained; Frankfurt, with 57.1 per cent lost and 38.0 per cent gained; Heidelberg, with 56.8 per cent lost and 48.6 per cent gained; Berlin, with

56.6 per cent lost and 43.8 per cent gained; and Göttingen, with 53.5 per cent lost and 44.8 per cent gained. These figures of faculty turnover seem to indicate unerringly those universities where National Socialist influence made itself most felt.

III. NATIONAL SOCIALIST ATTITUDES TOWARD SCIENCE

In the narrow sense, there is no rigorously consistent "official" National Socialist attitude toward science. However much one may seek for such a will-o'-the-wisp, he will not find it. That, however, the National Socialist regime has had a distinct effect on the course of scientific investigation, and that individual National Socialists have expressed certain attitudes toward science, are clear. The problem then is that of examining *contemporary German science*, with the purpose of discovering to what extent and in what specific senses this is or is not "Nazi" science. The results will be unsatisfactory to those who believe that everything that happens in contemporary Germany conforms to a simple plan in the minds of the leaders; but such results will be closer to the reality. Academic freedom in contemporary Germany cannot be understood apart from this complex semipolitical intellectual atmosphere, full of illogicalities and emotionalities, in which the scientist must do his work.

This atmosphere has undergone a certain change since the National Socialist influence first became apparent in the spring of 1933. The beginning was the "purge," under the terms of the Civil Service Law. While the effect of this law was spread over several years, since a considerable number of "non-Aryan" war veterans, putative "Aryans" later discovered to be "non-Aryans," "Aryans" with "non-Aryan" wives, and certain other groups, at first exempted, were later included, nevertheless it seems safe to assume that the

number of forced dismissals and even transferrals had decreased markedly by the winter of 1936-37.

A first approach to the problem of National Socialist attitudes toward science may therefore be made by seeking out the reasons for this official onslaught against the nation's scientific man-power. Was the purge a manifestation of rabid anti-intellectualism? It is often asserted that the Jacobins who guillotined Lavoisier defended themselves by saying: "The Revolution has no need for savants!" But it is as frequently forgotten that Lavoisier was hated for being a tax-farmer, and hence an "aristocrat": this was sufficient reason for condemning him, savant or not. Similarly, there can be no doubt that the German scientists who were ousted from their university posts by National Socialist legislation were attacked, not as chemists or historians or mathematicians and so forth, but as "state enemies" according to the official definition, in terms of ancestry or political viewpoint. There were undoubtedly borderline cases, where the mere existence of a certain field—say Sociology—or of certain theories contradicting the "official" Weltanschauung, as in Anthropology, was held to be a threat to the social order. Sometimes utterly petty offenses, such as the citation of "non-Aryan" authorities in scientific publications, were seized upon as pretexts to attack or to oust undesired scholars. But that the purge was not rationalized, on the whole, except in political terms is clearly revealed by an analysis of its incidence on various faculties and fields: for the more "useful" scientists suffered just as much as, in fact somewhat more than, their less "practical" colleagues.

The apparent illogicality of the distribution of losses can easily be seen if one compares the percentages of teachers in each of the main divisions of uni-

versity faculties who disappeared from the ranks during the four years before and during the four years after the coming of National Socialism, expressing the differences in terms of index numbers, as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1—Losses in Teachers

Faculty	Per cent Lost 1928-29 to 1932-33	Per cent Lost 1932-33 to 1936-37	Percentage Increase 1928-29 to 1932-33 = 100
Theology	26.8	41.5	155
Humanities	29.3	46.0	157
Law and Social Sciences	31.7	57.5	181
Natural Sciences	23.8	44.0	185
Medicine	22.4	48.8	218
All Faculties	25.8	47.1	183

This contrast shows that the "clean-up" of the faculties cannot be explained on any grounds of cool, utilitarian calculation; or else why should Theology, the government's principal enemy within, be favored at the expense of Medicine, a field which is always of great national importance and which in the new Germany, with the rapid growth of the army and labor service, has enormously increased in significance? The dismissals reveal an attitude not so much toward science itself as toward certain scientists as representatives of politically objectionable groups.

A similar conflict between ideology and practice becomes apparent if one analyzes the trends in student concentration, trends which have no little influence on the scope of work of the academic investigator and teacher. It is well known that the first four years of National Socialism saw a decrease in student enrollments at all institutions of higher learning of 42.2 per cent (excluding foreign students in Germany, whose numbers fell only 28.6 per cent). But those who believe that judicious planning has brought the remaining

students flocking to the banner of "national-political necessity" would do well to examine Table 2 showing shifts in student concentration, which to some extent bear out the paradoxical conclusions indicated by the differential incidence of the faculty purge.

TABLE 2—Student Distribution

Field	Winter Semester 1932-33	Winter Semester 1936-37	Percentage Change (1932-33 = 100)
Pedagogical Studies	5,831	8,317	142.5
Catholic Theology	4,208	4,775	113.5
Agricultural Sciences	1,356	1,477	109.0
Medical Sciences	32,437	22,797	70.2
Engineering Sciences	14,477	7,649	52.9
Law and Social Sciences	24,161	9,608	40.1
Protestant Theology	6,588	2,583	39.2
Humanities	14,078	5,188	36.8
Mathematics and Natural Sciences	12,951	4,616	35.6
Others	67		
All Fields	116,154	67,082	57.8

Here again, as in the faculty dismissals, the curious result appears that Theology has gained (or at least Catholic Theology, and this must be a sharp thorn in the flesh of the Nazi leaders), while the very mainstays of the nation's technology, Mathematics and the Natural Sciences, have fallen 64.4 per cent below their pre-Nazi concentration levels. Chemistry alone lost 42.0 per cent of its concentrators in this four-year period, Architecture 52.9 per cent, and even Modern Languages 76.6 per cent. At the same time the National Socialist fields par excellence, Pre-History and Racial Science, were not sufficiently popular to achieve separate listing in the official statistical reports on higher education for the academic years 1935-36 and 1936-37. The why's and wherefore's of these trends lie beyond the scope of the present essay, but these few comments may suffice to show that actual developments and governmental declarations of policy do not always coincide in the

Third Reich—in fact in this case are quite far apart.

NATIONALIZATION OF SCIENCE

Turning now to these official aims, one may perhaps epitomize them as efforts to hitch science to the national bandwagon. This attitude is evident in the preamble to a law of March 16, 1937, establishing a National Research Council (*Reichsforschungsrat*):

The great undertakings which the Four-Year Plan has set for German Science make it necessary that all the forces of research which can contribute to the fulfilling of these tasks be centrally coördinated and set in motion. The principle of free inquiry will not be interfered with by this direction of certain branches of science toward the goals of the Four-Year Plan, nor by the centralized allocation of research funds, nor by the systematic assignment of problems, since freedom of inquiry is based not on an arbitrary choice of problems, but on the independence with which the research process is carried out. At a historical moment like the present, when scientific investigation has the task of reaching goals on which the existence of the whole Nation depends, it is needless to explain why research must devote itself to this type of problem, and thus at the same time possibly have to neglect less important and less urgent problems—even when these latter may be more in keeping with the investigator's previous work and with the usual dispensation of funds.

Here at least is a definite declaration of policy: the scientist must demonstrate his usefulness to the nation, or —. The alternative is left undefined, but it is no doubt needless to explain to most of the scientists in Germany today what this alternative may be.

If one turns to the actual content of the lectures, the journals, the scientific gatherings, and so forth, it becomes apparent once more, however, that the whole field of knowledge has not been

"practicalized"—that there are manifestations of intellectual activity here and there, possibly of considerable significance, which do not fit in with the general plan, and that, moreover, the effect of practicalization on the various fields is far from uniform.

Would anyone argue that the publication of the second volume of Kant's unpublished works in the summer of 1937 was a decisive contribution to the march of fascism? Hardly! And the same may be argued for a good many other relatively esoteric research projects which go on in very much the old manner, as, for example, the work in some of the local historical journals such as the *Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte*, or local learned societies such as the old Leopoldina, which celebrated undisturbed its 250th anniversary in 1937. This type of closet research, however, is a decided exception to the general rule; it proceeds under imminent threat of extinction; and its survival is on the whole dependent upon the survival of its devotees, most of whom are well along in years and have little prospect of training successors. Yet its existence is noteworthy, and the continuous attention devoted to recent publications in the learned world, as evidenced by current reviews in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, edited under the auspices of the Union of German Scientific Academies, makes one hesitate to prophesy the extinction of German learning. Indeed, one unanticipated effect of the deliberate politicization of knowledge may be the encouragement of interest in recondite subjects beyond the ken or the concern of dictators.

SCIENTIFIC WORK DISGUISED

Other fields are able to carry along a fair amount of the old tradition by disguising their work with the labels which have now come into fashion. In

such cases the scientist must turn Machiavellian, or consult a public relations expert, in order to choose the proper titles and chapter headings, make the tactful dedication, and so word his preface and conclusion that the hasty reader may conclude with no hesitation that his work aims to strike another blow for the National Revolution—very much as "Christian" humanists in the latter days of the Roman Empire continued to study their Greek and Latin poets, but with the "purpose" of denouncing paganism. One favorite "manifestation of loyalty" is the dispatching of congratulatory telegrams to the *Führer* on the occasion of a scientific convention, especially if it "happens" to meet, as did that of the German Society for Internal Medicine in 1936, on the Leader's birthday.

The policy of giving a political coating to the scientific pill applies not only to individual works or scientists or conventions, but also to whole fields, to universities, and to faculties. The field of Mathematics may not have a particularly enviable reputation in the public mind, but once it is made clear that the mathematics for which the public had so little respect was "Jewish Mathematics," while "German Mathematics" is all that is fine and admirable, a step may be gained in security for the mathematical fraternity. Several learned "Archives" for this and that subject have become "German Archives." The "Society for Physical Anthropology," founded in 1925, recently became the "German Society for Racial Research." One of the most frequent disguises, or practical appeals, adopted by a field is the prefix *Wehr-*, meaning that the subject is studied with the problems of national defense, and possibly offense, in view. Thus the field of Medicine becomes, or at least a part of it becomes, *Wehrmedizin*, Physics becomes *Wehrphysik*, Botany *Wehr-*

botanik, and so forth. (The last term, one may imagine, refers perhaps to bacterial warfare, or more probably to agrarian policy in war time, including the problem of creating an "autarchical diet.") The central building of the transplanted University of Berlin, the cornerstone of which was laid November 26, 1937, is to house the *Wehrtechnische* Faculty; and it has been seriously urged that a real basis for "unifying" the whole field of knowledge may be achieved by considering each special branch as only one aspect of a universal "defense science," *Wehrwissenschaft*.

Thus the practical fields par excellence, the technologies, become the real center of interest—perhaps in a desperate effort to lure back students to the deserted ranks. (The term *Wissenschaft* itself, which in German had a much broader connotation than the English word "science," in that it included both the Humanities and the "Sciences," is used in a much narrower sense than formerly.) Not only has a National Research Council been created, but there are numerous "planning boards" for the special practical sciences: Aeronautics, Economics, Agriculture, and others.

EFFECTS OF PRACTICALIZATION

The effect of practicalization on the technological sciences may, for a time at least, prove stimulating; but the practicalization of those fields of learning which were traditionally pursued rather as ends in themselves cuts at the very root of the discipline. Instead of describing the past "as it actually was," the National Socialist historian is made to feel that he should aim to demonstrate from the past the validity of the prevailing political dogmas. History again, as in the eighteenth century, becomes "philosophy teaching by example." The doctrine that the past

must be *used*, not contemplated in passive enjoyment, illustrates a certain Puritan strain in the Nazi attitude toward science: not learning for its own sake, but learning in the service of the nation!

This attitude easily turns history into one of the more subtle forms of propaganda, and converts Sociology, Government, and Economics into strictly "Cameralistic" sciences, handmaidens to statecraft. Orientalists are urged to apply their learning to the promotion of German diplomatic interests with countries of the Near and Far East. Psychology begins to talk rather more loosely than before about community "souls" and racial "types," while Philosophy itself becomes lost in unintelligible elaborations of appropriate *Weltanschauung*. Casuistry has its heyday; vague and exalted verbalizations become more effective than ever as tools for putting the mind to sleep and arousing the emotions; and on the whole, except for the isolated figures and works which do not fit into the "plan," including those instances of "escape scholarship" noted above, it can scarcely be doubted that German "speculative science" is facing a severe crisis. The continued presence, and in some cases an actual increase in the number, of foreign contributions to German scientific journals, especially in the natural sciences, while it may be an indication in some cases of domestic weakness, in any event reduces the dangers of the growing provincialism.

INCONSISTENCIES

If one seeks, then, for the National Socialist attitude toward science in the actual practical effects of the policies of the Third Reich, one discovers a rather complicated situation, and in any case a basic contradiction. If it was the goal of the state to promote "useful" science, why did the authorities delib-

erately oust so many obviously "useful" scientists or so reduce the numbers of students in the "useful" sciences? But these questions spring from a misconception, for they assume that there was a "plan," and that all the policies of the regime had to be logically consistent with one another. However, it is clear that this is not the case.

It would probably be a closer approximation to the real situation to suppose that the Government did have certain political goals fairly clearly in mind, not all of which were mutually consistent; for example, (a) the desire to eliminate the Jews, and (b) the recognition of the vital importance of practical science. The discrepancy may have been recognized, but treated as of subordinate importance. In this case, there was a conflict between two elements in the ideology; and the dismissal of those Jews who happened to be scientists was apparently deemed more important than the retention of those scientists who happened to be Jews.

There is some evidence that such was Hitler's view in the spring of 1933. But there is also evidence that by the spring of 1937 Hitler was ready to recognize the necessity of taking a realistic attitude toward science. It was abundantly clear that not enough expert technicians were being trained, that university faculties had lost to a great extent their power of attracting young talent to their ranks, and that the country's industrial and military machine was faced with disaster if the supply of brains failed. The German press throughout 1937, including Nazi sheets like *Das Schwarze Korps*, *Die Bewegung*, *Der SA.-Mann*, *Der Angriff*, and others, was filled with anxious accounts of the threatening *Nachwuchsfrage*, the great problem of preserving the continuity of academic generations, of producing a sufficient supply of trained professional workers.

It was in this mood that Carl Bosch was appointed, in the spring of 1937, as head of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society for the Promotion of Scientific Research, and the story goes that Bosch, backed by the army, stood out against Hitler for four months until the latter guaranteed him full control of the research work in all its aspects. And there are other evidences that *Weltanschauung* has yielded a step here and there in favor of *Wissenschaft*. Else, why should Rosenberg make the rather startling announcement in an official Party organ, December 1937, that the Party as such took no dogmatic stand on "questions of cosmic physics, experimental chemistry and cosmogony"? Especially in the medical schools there are signs that politics, at least in its most obnoxious forms, has had its day.

A VAGUE POLICY

But the question remains: No matter what sort of science may slip by in contemporary Germany, and no matter what the Government does in the way of seeking to promote practical science with special organizations and grants of money, is there not a fundamental antagonism between the Government and science because of the official denunciation of the premise of scientific objectivity? The answer to this question involves a return to the beginning of the discussion. In what sense is this alleged denunciation official? And in what senses is scientific objectivity denounced?

Certainly one "official" declaration on the subject was that made by Minister of Education Rust at the Heidelberg Celebration in the spring of 1936, and it has been echoed in the last edition (1938) of Otto Koellreuter's authoritative *Deutsches Verfassungsrecht*. What Rust said on that occasion regarding this point can be summed up very simply. National Socialism is

against science, he argued, only if by science is meant knowledge divorced from ethical presuppositions. But even National Socialism recognizes "objectivity properly understood." What it opposes is the attempt to *substitute* objectivity for values, to *equate* objectivity with a state of mind which renounces all Weltanschauung. National Socialism does not seek to replace science by Weltanschauung, but it regards the latter, and in particular the National Socialist Weltanschauung, as a fruitful soil for the growth of science.

There are other official and semi-official pronouncements which adhere fairly closely to this argument. Some statements are more extreme, of the "Nordic Science" variety; others are less extreme, stressing the fact that a renunciation of objectivity in science would lead to an end of all science. There is considerable variation; there is frequent contradiction; and even the leading spokesmen are by no means always consistent. On this matter, as on most other basic philosophical issues in which they become involved, the Nazis leave their official position hazy and ambiguous.

In its simplest form, the argument advanced by Rust seems merely to imply that the scientist is a member of a social group, and, having certain ethical responsibilities toward that group, that he must consider its interest in matters pertaining to the socially relevant aspects of his work. If this were all that Rust meant, it would be difficult to disagree with him. The wolf in sheep's clothing is, however, the particular form of ethical loyalty which the German state, constituted as it is today, demands from the scientists who are responsible toward it. In the future development of science in the National Socialist state there can be no doubt that the ways in which the Government interprets the scientist's re-

sponsibility toward it and its own responsibility toward the scientist will be of decisive importance, for the scope of intellectual freedom will be thereby defined.

IV. ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR THE STUDENT?

The problem of academic freedom in the contemporary German universities is not exhausted by an indication of the legal status of the teacher and of the prevailing attitudes and policies towards scientific research. A university is an association of masters and scholars, of teachers and students, and academic freedom pertains to the opportunities of both. For the German university student the problem of freedom is complex, since he has traditionally enjoyed not only a remarkable liberty of choice with regard to his academic training (*Lernfreiheit*), but also many time-honored privileges and immunities with regard to the general manner in which he conducted his life. The gay and indomitable spirit of *Burschenfreiheit* found expression in many of the famous German student songs, whose verses and melodies have become veritable classics of youthful idealism—

*Und sperrt man mich ein
Im finsternen Kerker
Das alles sind rein
Vergebliche Werke;
Denn meine Gedanken
Zerreißen die Schranken
Und Mauern entzwei:
Die Gedanken sind frei!*

The springing up of patriotic student clubs and societies in the Napoleonic period had not a little to do with stimulating the national uprising against the oppressor, and in the reaction which followed the victorious War of Liberation the students resented bitterly the imputation that they were dangerous radicals. The German student movement endured martyrdom under Met-

ternich only to emerge all the more triumphant under Bismarck, for it regarded the unification of Germany as its peculiar mission.

There is a certain rough parallel between this earlier development and the destinies of the student movement after the World War, a parallel to some extent realized and exploited as a myth by Nazi leaders. Versailles became the symbol of the oppressor from without, and the Republic the symbol of weak acquiescence at home; Minister Becker (of all people!) became the reincarnation of Metternich—because he refused to allow the inclusion of anti-Semitic student groups (in Austria and Czechoslovakia) within the federal German Student Union, and withdrew state recognition of the Union (in 1927), when an impasse resulted; finally, Hitler became the new national hero, who, like Bismarck, would lead the nation from disaster into glory.

What proportion of the student body subscribed to this myth, either in whole or in part, at the moment Hitler took over the government, it is difficult to say, but the fact remains that throughout the spring of 1933 considerable numbers of students were active agents of the Party in carrying through the purge of the faculty and student body. Many students spoke and behaved as if the National Socialist Revolution were the culmination of a century of student efforts, and certain faculty sympathizers at first shared their enthusiasm. But after that brief taste of glory the student movement came upon evil days.

THE GOVERNMENT AND STUDENTS

The Government's policies toward the student body, like their policies toward science, with which they are to some extent connected, have not been simple but complex, even confused. In the early days of May 1933, the

Minister of Education issued the first of a long series of rebukes to the students for their disorderly and undisciplined behavior: study was a privilege and a duty of great national significance, which they should take more seriously. Traditional student pastimes were frowned upon, and an attempt was made to disband the old fraternities. A sentimental "last Wartburg Celebration" was held October 18, 1935, at which the old *Burschenschaften* symbolically laid down their festive caps and colors and donned the sober brown shirt. There were a good many sighs in the press at this "sad event," and considerable resentment among the students themselves, who began to wonder whether they had spoken of Metternich too soon. The "student problem" (as even Reich-Student-Leader Scheel admitted) came to rank with the "church problem" as one of the nation's prime sources of trouble.

During the year 1937 the Government made certain gestures of reconciliation. Dueling was condoned; a museum for student history at Göttingen received official support; and certain of the old student formations were revived and adapted to perform their old functions in the new state. What the upshot will be it is impossible to say, but one may infer that it will take more than a restoration of dueling and other isolated manifestations of student sentiment to reestablish anything like the old freedom, and the Government may find itself put to it to find ways to entice the youth into its "reformed" universities. "*O alte Burschenherrlichkeit, wohin bist du verschwunden? . . . O jerum, jerum, jerum, O quae mutatio rerum!*"

QUALITY OF STUDENTS AND UNIVERSITIES

More important, however, is that other aspect of student academic free-

dom, namely, "freedom to learn"; and if *Lehrfreiheit* has suffered, so has *Lernfreiheit*. The new criteria by which students are selected for university study, stressing the sort of moral, physical, and intellectual qualities which result from training in the camps of the Hitler Youth, have in all probability lowered the standing of the student body. The non-Aryans, a generally gifted group, have been almost eliminated. The number of women students has been halved, the number of men reduced by two-fifths. New students are older and less well-prepared than their predecessors, having sacrificed two and a half years altogether to Labor and Military Service. More demands are made on the student's time after matriculation for sports and political duties of various kinds.

Most significant of all, however, the universities which the student finally enters are in many ways unfit to give him the education he might have obtained before 1933. The libraries and laboratories are still there, to be sure, hampered though they are through lack of adequate resources—especially in the purchase of foreign literature—but a university cannot teach with libraries and laboratories alone. The transformed German university may perform useful functions of one sort or another in the new state, but one thing it is not, a "society of teachers and scholars"—a *Lehr- und Lerngemeinschaft*. Where teachers and pupils spy on one another for signs of political heterodoxy, of what value is the seminar, or even the lecture, as a pedagogical device? Where professors are directed to be lenient toward politically active students, what becomes of the academic selective system? After all that has been said, need one indeed seriously inquire what the German student's opportunities for study may be,

in the reconstructed National Socialist university? Many of his best teachers have been lost and are unreplaced; many silenced; many so muzzled that the potentially interested student, failing to be fired with enthusiasm, perhaps never reaches intellectual maturity at all, perhaps succumbs to the all-pervading political ideology and concludes that it is acts, not thoughts, that count in the end—not adventures of the mind, but conquests with the spade or the bayonet.

Added restraint in his private life, serious loss of opportunity for his intellectual development: such are two of the results of National Socialism for the university student.

V. THE OUTLOOK FOR GERMAN SCHOLARSHIP

In his admirable remarks at the International Physiological Congress in Moscow, 1935, Dr. W. B. Cannon outlined what seemed to him to be the main sociological conditions of productive scholarship. The fact that German delegates at the Congress felt it necessary to hold a meeting to discuss whether they should protest against these remarks, even though their country had not been mentioned in other than a favorable sense, showed that a mere declaration of principles had led them to think that they were being criticized.

The German physiologists' sensitivity to their situation is not surprising, since conditions existing in Germany today violate Dr. Cannon's principles on almost every score—which is not to imply, as Dr. Cannon rightly argues, that other countries, including our own, are not in some or all of these respects sinners as well.

The German scientist under National Socialism must certainly feel insecure. At almost every stage of his work he must face the unnerving question:

How will the authorities react? He is wholly under the control of a dogmatic authoritarian state and, to an extent scarcely less damaging to his freedom, he is under pressure from various pseudo-scientific groups of cultists clothed with official or semiofficial prestige. Many fields are arbitrarily deprived of funds and other resources. Many capable and even preëminent workers are thrown into conditions of exile from the seats of learning and research—within their own country. Others are forced to beg their living from foreigners, and only a portion of these have found satisfactory opportunities for continuing their work.

The new National Research Council has the power to "assign" research projects to the "soldiers" in the nation's "army" of science whether they desire it or no—in the name of national security! Research work and publication must justify themselves on practical grounds, either as politically efficacious propaganda or as nationally useful technology. Pressure is exerted to "get things done" speedily: the Four-Year Plan demands "results"! There is no "leisure class" in the German totalitarian state, and little enough of that leisure of mind so necessary for scientific speculation. Fruitful interchange of ideas among scientists is hampered even within Germany, to say nothing of intercourse with scholars of other nations.

The stimulus and steady flow of new ideas brought to university life by a cosmopolitan and able student body are sorely lacking. Confronted by teachers who dare not speak their true minds, the students' attitude of confidence and respect is undermined, and with it the whole process of teaching, for the effectiveness of teaching rests on the intellectual integrity of the teacher and on the recognition of this integrity by the student. A Chinese

student at Berlin a few years ago told the writer in laconic German that he was reminded at every turn of the University of Tokyo: "*Das nicht gut. Wissenschaft braucht Ruhe.*" The "Teutonic Soul" has drawn within itself again, and the unity of Western learning, and even of world scholarship, is imperiled.

It is easy enough to condemn; but the aim here has been simply to describe the situation and thereby provide the groundwork for a prognosis. After all, our main concern is not the evil that has been done, but the good that may come, despite the obstacles. What are, then, the chances for German science?

It should not be forgotten that German scholarship once flourished under a powerful monarchy, when it was ruled by an iron hand, and that it also flourished under a Republican regime despite the shocks of revolution, inflation, economic crisis, political strife, and national ignominy. Far more fundamental in these matters than the form of government, more fundamental even than economic conditions, is the prevailing philosophy of science. If science is regarded as a value in itself, and if the university is conceived as being dedicated to the pursuit of scientific truth and to this pursuit alone, then science will be favored—and so it was in Germany during most of the nineteenth century and up until 1933, *despite* intermittent incursions on academic liberties.

NAZI VIEW OF SCIENCE

But if science is regarded merely as the instrument of national policy, the scientist as a technological soldier in the service of the state, and the university as a training school to turn out technologists and propagandists for the national defense—the philosophy which came in with National Socialism—then

the outlook for science is dark. Here is the challenge:

We renounce international science. We renounce the international republic of learning. We renounce research for its own sake. We teach and learn medicine, not to increase the number of known microbes, but to keep the German people strong and healthy. We teach and learn history, not to say how things actually happened, but to instruct the German people from the past. We teach and learn the sciences, not to discover abstract laws, but to sharpen the implements of the German people in their competition with other peoples.²

The reversal of university ideals in the new Germany is manifest in two further points of fundamental difference between the Empire and the Republic on the one hand and National Socialism on the other—to say nothing of the absolutist state, with which the latter has not a few similarities, but also some important differences. In the new state the civil servant (and such is the professor) is no longer politically neutral, but politically bound. He is committed to its philosophy and must not only refrain from criticizing the government but must openly fend for it in word, deed, and attitude. In their demands for positive expressions of loyalty from the civil servant the Nazis far outdo prewar Germany. Secondly, in their prescription of an official doctrine in certain fields of learning, the contrast is still greater. Under these circumstances the observance of the professional code of scholarship becomes a practical impossibility. The exercise of caution in scientific statement, the maintenance at all times of a rigorous distinction between what is so and what may be so, and the consequent exclusion from the academic world of all quackeries and pseudo-scientific cults—these primary tenets of the scientific ethic, which Virchow and

others championed even at a time when their future seemed secure, have been cast to the winds in the stormy intellectual atmosphere of National Socialism, where fact, hypothesis, and mere fancy may be all propounded together with the voice of political authority.

A GROUND FOR HOPE

The position of science in contemporary Germany is precarious, but there is one ground for hope, and this lies in that very preoccupation with political goals which has apparently had so disastrous an effect. Germany's strength as a nation depends not on her natural resources, which are meager, but on the intelligence which she can bring to bear in utilizing what resources she has. This is known to every thinking German, and the declaration attributed to a Prussian King hemmed in by Napoleon's armies—"We must make good with our minds what we lack in physical resources"—is almost a national motto. It can scarcely be doubted that the present government realizes the emergency only too well, and that sooner or later it must take a more realistic stand toward science. It is reassuring that large funds are being devoted to certain types of research and that special coördinating organizations have been set up. These organizational moves would be more convincing were it clear that the leaders behind them had more real understanding of the delicate problem of administering scientific research, and were it also clear that the gaps in scientific manpower occasioned by the purge were being filled in.

As in the Third Reich's policy as a whole, so here, there is a conflict between moderates and extremists, between hard-headed political realists backed up by the army and heavy industry, and hot-headed partisans of a political creed they would like to carry

² Speech of Professor Kahrstedt, Göttingen, Empire Day, Jan. 18, 1934.

through though they die in the attempt. Thus the fate of science in contemporary Germany depends, as in all state-controlled educational systems, on the political destinies of the nation as a whole. But it seems likely that in the very effort to achieve practical goals it will be necessary—sooner or later—to sacrifice elements of sanctimonious belief in the interests of technological efficiency. And if real technological progress is made, and if economic plenty and political security follow in its wake, it may be that Leviathan can relax, and then German science may breathe freely again. But whether, as long as the ends of the system are dictated by political interest alone, and as long as an independent intellectual middle class is prevented from developing, such a flourishing of technological science, narrowly conceived, could give rise to a German culture whose values would transcend standards of efficiency—that is another question.

NOTE ON SOURCES

For a fuller treatment of certain points the reader may refer to E. Y. Hartshorne, *The German Universities and National Socialism*, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1937, and to the same writer's Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1938, where especially statistical matters are entered into more thoroughly. In addition to the sources referred to in these works and in the preceding essay, attention may be called to G. Kaufmann, *Die Lehrfreiheit an den deutschen Universitäten im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Leipzig, 1898; C. Bornhak, *Die Rechtsverhältnisse der Hochschullehrer in Preussen*, Berlin, 1901, and the article "Universitäten," in Stengel-Fleischmann, *Wörterbuch des deutschen Staats- und Verwaltungsrechts*, 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1914, III, 634-37; E. Horn, "Akademische Freiheit," Berlin, 1905; J. Donat, *Die Freiheit der Wissenschaft*, Innsbruck, 1909 (3rd ed., 1925); G. Holstein, "Hochschule und Staat," *Das akademische Deutschland*, Berlin, 1930, III, 127-42; and G. Anschütz, *Die Verfassung des Deutschen Reichs*, 14th ed., Berlin, 1933, pp. 658-66.

For discussions of academic freedom under the Empire see R. Virchow, *Die Freiheit der Wissenschaft im modernen Staat*, Berlin, 1877, and his address as Rector of the University of Berlin,

1893, translated in the *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution*, 1894, Washington, 1896, pp. 681-95; E. Haeckel, *Freedom in Science and Teaching*, translated with a prefatory note by T. H. Huxley, New York, 1879; F. Paulsen, "Die akademische Lehrfreiheit und ihre Grenzen," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 91 (1898), 515-31; H. Delbrück, "Das Disziplinalgesetz für den Privatdozenten," *ibid.*, 388-92. On the Kant affair see L. Spiegel, "Kants Massregelung," *Kantfestschrift der Internationalen Vereinigung für Rechts- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie*, Berlin, 1924, 177-82. On the "Göttingen Seven" see H. Kück, *Die "Göttinger Sieben"*, Berlin, 1934. On the Arons case see *Die Actenstücke des Disziplinarverfahrens gegen den Privatdozenten Dr. Arons*, Berlin, 1900. Perhaps the best single source on the prewar period is A. Sachse, *Friedrich Althoff und sein Werk*, Berlin, 1928, while much valuable material is contained in other biographies and autobiographies of scholars such as Lujo Brentano, Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Adolf von Harnack, Max Weber, and others.

Memoirs on the Republican period are for the most part as yet unpublished, but the roots of the intellectual crisis are clearly revealed in the controversy provoked by Max Weber's essay, "Wissenschaft als Beruf," of 1919, especially E. Troeltsch, "Die Revolution in der Wissenschaft," *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 45 (1921), 1001-30, which reviews the contributions of E. von Kahler and A. Salz, and Max Scheler, "Weltanschauungslehre, Soziologie und Weltanschauungssetzung," *Schriften zur Soziologie und Weltanschauungslehre*, Leipzig, 1923, I, 1-25.

Mention should also be made of W. Kotschnig, *Unemployment in the Learned Professions*, New York, 1937, which devotes considerable attention to Germany. The type of research embodied in *National Libraries and Foreign Scholarship*, by D. Waples and H. D. Lasswell, Chicago, 1936, could be profitably extended to cover the contemporary German situation. On the status of the civil servant see K. Loewenstein, "Dictatorship and the German Constitution: 1933-1937," *University of Chicago Law Review*, 4 (June 1937), 537-74, and F. Morstein Marx, "Germany's New Civil Service Act," *American Political Science Review*, 31 (Oct. 1937), 878-83. The September 1937 issue of *Social Research* contains a number of important essays, especially those by F. Wunderlich, A. Löwe, and R. Ulich, whose "Libertas Philosophandi," *Harvard Educational Review*, 7 (Jan. 1937), 36-51, should also be noted in this connection. By far the most revealing published document on intellectual conditions in the Third Reich, in the writer's opinion thoroughly reliable, is Eva Lips, *Savage Symphony*, New York, 1938. See also *Freie Wissenschaft*:

Ein Sammelbuch aus der deutschen Emigration, edited by E. J. Gumbel, Strasbourg, 1938, especially the essays by T. Geiger, "Aufgabe und Schicksal der Intellektuellen," and Gumbel, "Arische Naturwissenschaft?"

Finally, attention should be called to the collection of unpublished official correspondence

from the German Government to members of university faculties, 1932-35, and other relevant documentary material, in the Harvard Library (Educ. 4637.9.5, Educ. 4637.9.10), and to the newspaper archive on educational problems in Germany and other countries, in the Library of the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

E. Y. Hartshorne, Ph.D., is instructor in sociology at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. During the year 1935-36 he was a Fellow of the Social Science Research Council, in Germany. He is author of "The German Universities and National Socialism" (1937).

